

Remarks

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action dated as mailed June 14, 2007 and the documents cited therewith. After the above amendments have been made, the present application contains claims 1-21, and 28-33. Claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 16, 21, and 28-33 have been amended. Claims 22-27 have been canceled.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 28-32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention was asserted to be directed to non-statutory subject matter in that the specification recites that the computer readable medium could be paper. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 28 has been amended to recite:

“A computer-readable medium having computer executable instructions encoded thereon for performing a method...”

Additionally, dependent claims 29-32 have been amended to recite similar language. M.P.E.P. § 2106.01 I. recites in the first paragraph:

“In contrast, a claimed computer-readable medium encoded with a data structure defines structural and functional interrelationships between the data structure and the computer software and hardware components which permit the data structure’s functionality to be realized, and is thus statutory.” (emphasis added)

Applicant respectfully submits that computer executable instructions encoded on a computer-readable medium as provided in amended claims 28-32 is distinguishable from lines of code printed on a sheet of paper. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 28-32 as amended correspond to the language of M.P.E.P. § 2106.01 I. as quoted above as being statutory subject matter. Therefore, claims 28-32 are respectfully submitted to recite statutory subject matter, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 101 rejection of claims 28-32 is respectfully solicited.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-33 were rejected under U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett et al. (U.S. Patent 5,727,129; hereinafter Barrett) in view of Goldstein et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0221167; hereinafter Goldstein). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

“loading a URL personal databook collection object in response to receiving the results of a network search by a search engine, wherein the URL personal databook collection object comprises URL references that have been previously visited by a user and selectively saved in the URL personal databook collection object by the user; and a comment, associated with each URL reference, entered and saved by the user to indicate a reason why each URL reference was stored in the URL personal databook collection object;”

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Barrett nor Goldstein teach or suggest a personal databook collection object that comprises URL references and a comment, associated with each URL reference, entered and saved by the user to indicate a reason why each URL reference was stored in the URL personal databook collection object. Column 8, lines 56-57 of Barrett were cited in the Office Action in rejecting the feature of claim 5 of “presenting any saved or captured comments” which is similar to the feature of claim 1 recited above. Column 8, lines 56-59 recite:

“Also in accordance with the invention, information pertaining to the statistics are shown. For instance, separate displays generally shown as 52, are given, preferably adjacent to the respective URLs, showing the number of past occurrences.”

Accordingly, Barrett teaches displaying statistics related to the number of past occurrences that the user has gone to a respective Web page in the past from the currently-displayed page (Barrett Column 8, lines 50-54). Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Barrett of a URL personal databook collection object that comprises a URL reference and a comment associated with the URL reference, entered and saved by the user, to indicate a reason

why each URL reference was stored in the URL personal databook collection object as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in independent claim 1.

Further, the statistics in Barrett are generated based on the number of times the user previously went to the Web page from the currently-displayed page (Barrett Column 8, lines 50-54). There is no teaching or suggestion in Barrett that these statistics are entered and save by the user. This would necessitate the extremely burdensome task of the user having to keep track himself of all Web site visits which Barrett has undoubtedly automated.

Applicant also respectfully submits there is also no teaching or suggestion in Goldstein of a personal databook collection object that comprises URL references that have been previously visited by a user and selectively saved in the URL personal databook collection object by the user. Nor does Goldstein teach or suggest that the URL personal databook collection object also includes a comment, associated with each URL reference, entered and saved by the user to indicate a reason why each URL reference was stored in the URL personal databook collection object as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in amended claim 1.

For all of the reasons discussed above, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as amended is patentably distinguishable over Barrett and Goldstein, whether considered individually or combined, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103 rejection of claim 1 is respectfully solicited.

Turning now to the rejection of claims 2-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of Goldstein, these claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over Barrett and Goldstein. For example, claim 2 recites:

“...comparing the results from the search to any URL object references in the URL personal databook collection object to identify any matches.”

In contrast, Barrett in column 7, lines 37-40 recites:

“The profile will contain a history of past visitations (i.e., downloadings) of that same Web page, and the various other pages that the user went to, from this page.”

And Barrett further teaches in column 7, lines 57-61 cited in rejecting claim 2:

“In step 28, the information stored in the profile is further processed to determine, for each past download, where else on the Web the user was located. Accordingly, if there is a given other Web page from which the user repeatedly came to this page, that other Web page will be so identified.”

Accordingly, Barrett teaches that the profile contains a history of all past visitations or downloads of a Web page and does not only contain those Web pages that have been selectively saved by a user (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Barrett of a URL personal databook collection object including URL references that have been previously visited and selectively saved by the user in the URL personal databook collection object as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in claim 1 and as quoted above. Barrett also does not teach or suggest comparing the results from the search to any URL object references in the URL personal databook collection object to identify any matches as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in claim 2.

Additionally claim 5 recites:

“...presenting the saved comment associated with any match only in response to positioning a computer pointing device on a selected visually identified match in the results from the search, wherein the saved comment is presented as a balloon from the associated match on a page displaying the search results.”

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Barrett nor Goldstein teach or suggest the features of the embodiment of the present invention as recited in amended claim 5. Column 8, lines 56-57 and column 8, line 63-65 of Barrett were cited for rejecting claim 5. Column 8, lines 54-57 of Barrett recite:

“The pages themselves are shown as URLs 50. Alternatively, icons, descriptive texts, etc., may be displayed. Also in accordance with the invention, information pertaining to the statistics are shown.”

And Barrett in column 8, lines 62-65 recites:

“To prompt the user to select one of these other Web pages, the URLs 50 are preferably hyperlinks. Accordingly, easy access to the other pages, by way of a single mouse click, is facilitated.”

Thus, Barrett teaches that any icons, descriptive text, etc. are always displayed and that the URLs 50 are hyperlinks to other Web pages which are accessed by way of a mouse click as recited in column 8, lines 62-65 of Barrett. Barrett does not teach or suggest presenting the saved comment associated with any match only in response to positioning a computer pointing device on a selected visually identified match in the results from the search as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in dependent claim 5.

Barrett also does not teach or suggest that the comment is presented as a balloon from the associated match on a page displaying the search results. Barrett teaches that the URLs are hyperlinks to Web pages not a comment why a URL was saved. Therefore, the system goes to the actual Web page associated with the URL when the hyperlink is clicked on. There is no teaching or suggestion in Barrett that a comment why a particular URL was saved is presented as a balloon from the associated match on the page displaying the search results as provided by the embodiment of the present invention as recited in amended claim 5.

Applicant further respectfully submits that Goldstein does not teach or suggest the features of the embodiment of the present invention as recited in amended claim 5.

Additionally, claims 2-10 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and by virtue of that dependency, contain all of the features of independent claim 1. For all of the reasons discussed above, claims 2-10 are submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Barrett and Goldstein, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 of claims 2-10 is respectfully solicited.

Turning now to the rejection of independent claims 11, 16 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of Goldstein, independent claims 11, 16 and 28 have been amended to recite similar features to independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 11, 16 and 28 are submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Barrett and Goldstein for the same

reasons as discussed with respect to independent claim 1. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of claims 11, 16 and 28 is respectfully solicited.

Regarding the rejection of claims 12-15, 17-21 and 29-32, claims 12-15 depend directly from independent claim 11; claims 17-21 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 16; and claims 29-32 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 28. Because of these dependencies, these dependent claims include all of the features of the respective, referenced independent claim. Therefore, claims 12-15, 17-21, and 29-32 are also submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Barrett and Goldstein. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection of these claims is respectfully requested.

Turning now to the rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of Goldstein, claim 33 recites:

“presenting any the reason why a selected URL was previously visited only in response to positioning a computer pointing device on a selected match in the results from the search, wherein the reason is presented as a balloon associated with the selected match on a page displaying the search results.”

As previously discussed, neither Barrett nor Goldstein teach or suggest storing a reason why a selected URL was previously visited. Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that neither Barrett nor Goldstein teach or suggest presenting the reason why a selected URL was previously visited only in response to positioning a computer pointing device on a selected match in the results from the search and wherein the reason is presented on a page displaying the search results. Further, neither Barrett nor Goldstein teach or suggest that the reason is presented in a balloon associated with the selected match on a page displaying the search results.

Additionally, claim 33 depends directly from independent claim 1, and by virtue of that dependency, claim 33 includes all of the features of independent claim 1. For all of these, claim 33 is respectfully submitted to be patentably distinguishable over Barrett and Goldstein, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of dependent claim 33 is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

If the Examiner wishes to discuss any aspects of this amendment, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-4365.

Respectfully submitted,

Fonda J. Daniels
(Applicant)

Date: September 11, 2007

By: Charles L. Moore
Charles L. Moore
Registration No. 33,742
Moore & Van Allen PLLC
P.O. Box 13706
Research Triangle Park, N.C. 27709
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199